

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of June 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217–211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423–1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95)
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228–204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253–172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414–4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252–170 A: 255–168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233–176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	National Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 233–183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1617	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223–180 A: 245–155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O—open rule; MO—modified open rule; MC—modified closed rule; C—closed rule; A—adoption vote; PQ—previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed until completion of action on House Resolution 168.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I was objecting to a vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes that.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

ESTABLISHING A CORRECTIONS CALENDAR IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 168 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 168

Resolved, That clause 4 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"4. (a) After a bill has been favorably reported and placed on either the Union or House Calendar, the Speaker may, after consultation with the Minority Leader, file with the Clerk a notice requesting that such bill also be placed upon a special calendar to be known as the "Corrections Calendar". On the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month, after the Pledge of Allegiance, the Speaker may direct the Clerk to call the bills in numerical order which have been on the Corrections Calendar for three legislative days.

"(b) A bill so called shall be considered in the House, debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the primary committee of jurisdiction reporting the bill, shall not be subject to amendment except those amendments recommended by the primary committee of jurisdiction or those of-

ferred by the chairman of the primary committee, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment there to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

"(c) A three-fifths vote of the members voting shall be required to pass any bill called from the Corrections Calendar but the rejection of any such bill, or the sustaining of any point of order against it or its consideration, shall not cause it to be removed from the Calendar to which it was originally referred."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 168 is the long-awaited reform to create a new House Corrections Calendar for legislation that would repeal or correct laws, rules, and regulations that are obsolete, ludicrous, duplicative, burdensome, or costly.

The idea was first proposed by our Speaker back in February of this year, and it has since captured the imagination and enthusiastic support of our colleagues and the American people alike.

The resolution amends clause 4 of House Rule 13 by repealing the obsolete Consent Calendar and by replacing it with the new Corrections Calendar.

The Consent Calendar has not been used since the 101st Congress and, even then, was only used for three bills.

For bills to be placed on the Corrections Calendar, they must first be reported by the committee of jurisdiction and placed on their normal Calendar. The Speaker could then place the bills on the Corrections Calendar after consultation with the minority leader.

The Calendar could be called on the second or fourth Tuesday of each month, at the discretion of the Speaker, after the Pledge of Allegiance. Bills

would be called in the numerical order of their placement on the Calendar, after pending there for at least 3 legislative days, following the existing rules of the House.

The bills would be debated for 1 hour equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the primary committee of jurisdiction. No amendments would be allowed unless recommended by the primary committee or offered by its chairman.

Each bill would provide for one motion to recommit with or without instructions. That means a final, alternative amendment or substitute could be considered, debatable for 10 minutes divided between the proponent and an opponent.

Finally, the rule provides for a three-fifths vote to pass a bill on the Corrections Calendar.

We think the three-fifths super-majority vote for Corrections Calendar bills is a reasonable middle ground between a two-thirds, which is used for suspensions when the bills are reasonably noncontroversial, and a simple majority vote when bills are extremely controversial. The bills should be relatively noncontroversial and bipartisan, but there is bound to be some controversy on some of these measures. Even so-called stupid rules will have their defenders.

Given the prospect of some controversy on some corrections bills, we purposely built-in the ability of the minority to offer an amendment as part of a motion to recommit with instructions. This is something that is not available under the suspension process.

Nor do bills have to be reported from a committee to be considered under suspension. It was the strong feeling of the Speaker and his advisory group that drafted this proposal that regular process should be followed at the committee level for a bill to be eligible for the Corrections Calendar.

Moreover, suspension bills can be in violation of House rules and still be considered. Corrections bills do not have such protection against points of order. They must be in conformity with House rules. The only exception is that a corrections bill will not be subject to the point of order that it should be considered in the Committee of the Whole. Instead, the bills will be considered in the House under the 1-hour rule.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Speaker on originating this idea and on following through on it by appointing

the special advisory group that developed and drafted the rule before us today. That advisory group consists of Representative BARBARA VUCANOVICH, its chairman, and Representatives ZELIFF and MCINTOSH.

□ 1130

They have put in countless hours in perfecting the concept and in gathering support for it. We all owe them a debt of gratitude in bringing this to the Rules Committee and to the House floor today.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other concerns expressed by the minority is that this process may not have sufficient input from the minority. To address that concern, we adopted the amendment requiring the Speaker to consult with the minority leader before placing any bill on the Corrections Calendar. The minority would have preferred giving the minority leader veto power over placing bills on the Corrections Calendar, but we felt that went too far in interfering with the scheduling prerogatives of the majority leadership.

Moreover, we included report language at the suggestion of the minor-

ity, urging the Speaker to follow through on his stated aim of having a bipartisan group of Members to help develop criteria for corrections bills and in recommending which bills should go on the calendar.

I am pleased to report that today the Speaker will act on his original intention to have a bipartisan advisory group—even without the benefit of our report language. In addition to the initial three-member group, the Speaker has named four additional Republicans and five Democrats recommended by the minority leader. So this should go a long way toward meeting the major concerns expressed by the minority.

It is our hope that we will see bills by Members of both parties considered under this process.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the work of the Speaker's advisory group and the further amendments adopted by the Rules Committee, help to ensure that this will follow the normal committee process and will allow for minority participation and input at every step of the process—including the right

of the minority to offer a final floor amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Corrections Day resolution before us is another positive step forward by this House in relieving our constituents, local governments and small businesses of the needless, and costly red tape that has hampered their ability to fully and freely contribute to the betterment of their communities and to the creation of new job opportunities, economic growth, and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very excited about this new Corrections Calendar because we really are going to take the burden off of small business in particular, which creates 75 percent of all the new jobs in America every single year. If you don't think that is important, look at all the graduating seniors from college today, look at all the graduating seniors from high school today, and look at the lack of job opportunity out there. We need this kind of Corrections Calendar, and I hope it passes unanimously today.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 19, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	29	73
Modified Closed ³	49	47	11	27
Closed ⁴	9	9	0	0
Totals:	104	100	40	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt.	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif.	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: v.v. (2/27/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	O	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/1/95).
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt.	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1617	MillCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

For example, let me point out some of the very serious problems I have in my own congressional district and even my own home town of Glens Falls in upstate New York.

As you might expect, nestled in the middle of the Adirondack mountains and on the shore of Lake George, tourism and forestry are the major industries in my home town. Both of these industries are threatened by extreme environmental regulations. Another industry which has sprung up in the region during the past 10 years, three major medical device companies, are now moving off shore because of restrictive and senseless Food and Drug Administration regulations.

Most recently, a 100-year-old cement company may be forced to close their doors because of a new interpretation of Clean Air regulations by the EPA.

Mr. Speaker, Glens Falls, NY, is small town U.S.A. and just look at what the Federal Government is doing to it. Let me give you specific examples of the devastation misguided Government regulations have caused in my home town.

The Cluster Rule caused Scott Paper to lay off 400 people.

The Cluster Rule may force Finch, Pruyn paper company to lay off 1,000 workers.

The safe drinking water act requires the hotel and motel owners to put up unsafe drinking water warning signs—killing tourism and costing hundreds of jobs.

New EPA kiln emissions standards could put Glens Falls cement out of business—another 130 people unemployed.

In 1994, Mallinckrodt Medical announced plans to relocate its manufacturing operations to Ireland and Mexico where they can market their products directly to the EEC without waiting 5 to 10 years for F.D.A. approval. This cost 450 jobs.

A similar medical device company, Angio Dynamics, is also considering closing its doors and moving to Ireland for the same reason. This could cost another 400 jobs.

Additionally, allow me to outline the traumatic effect of the Cluster Rule on the paper industry, not only in my district, but in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the Cluster Rule is the biggest and most costly rule ever proposed by the EPA for a single industry. Because of the inflexibility and tremendous costs involved, 33 U.S. paper mills could be forced to close, eliminating 21,000 jobs.

For Finch, Pruyn paper mill in Glens Falls, the effect is even more damaging. That is because the most stringent aspect of the EPA's Cluster Rule applies solely to the small category of papergrade sulfite mills they belong to. This is the aspect which requires totally chlorine-free bleaching. While EPA intended to eliminate the discharge of chlorinated compounds into waterways, they determined technology did not exist to permit the larger category of kraft mills to adopt totally chlorine-free paper bleaching. Thus only papergrade sulfite mills would have to comply.

This regulation undermines the economy of upstate New York. It is not based on good

science, it upsets the competitive balance of the open market and threatens the very existence of a 130-year-old company. This is a prime example of the type of damaging regulations we need to remedy through Corrections Day.

All in all, the small Glens Falls area in upstate New York is subject to losing upwards of 2,500 jobs as a direct result of excessive Government regulation. Mr. Speaker, Corrections Day would provide the ideal forum to rectify these grave ills facing the American worker.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to this resolution, and we urge Members to vote "no" on the previous question, and "no" on the resolution. We need to go back to the drawing board and develop a corrections process that is fair and bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of us agree that it could be useful for the House of Representatives to try a new way of facilitating changes in laws and regulations that are not working well. The reason that the Corrections Day idea resonates is that all of us can give examples of regulations that seem to defy common sense, and all of us have probably experienced the frustration of getting nowhere with changes we suggest to certain laws.

From time to time, constituents bring thoughtful ideas to me about changes they think should be made in a law, and I send their ideas over to the appropriate committees, but we do not always get a response—not even the assurance that the committee is looking into the matter. Being able to submit ideas to an advisory panel that carries more weight with committees—as proponents of Corrections Day envision—might give us a more effective avenue to pursue such changes.

What many of us find appealing about the proposed corrections process is the idea that our committees would, presumably, receive strong messages about problems with laws under their jurisdiction. As a result, they would likely do a better job of finding out exactly what agencies are doing, and figuring out how the implementation of the laws under their jurisdiction can be improved. This process has the potential to greatly improve congressional oversight and, if it does, it will have turned out to be a useful and constructive tool.

What concerns us, however, about the Corrections Day idea is the specific rule change before us today. We believe that this new and unusual procedure is both unfair to the minority, and unnecessary. In fact, the entire corrections process has not been well thought out,

so it is premature for the House to act on any rule change for this purpose.

Proponents of House Resolution 168 have failed to make a convincing case for the need to establish a floor procedure for considering so-called corrections bills that differ from existing procedures. As Members know, the House already has a procedure—suspension of the rules—that permits the expedited consideration of relatively non-controversial bills. This procedure has been a feature of the House since 1822, and is well accepted by both minority and majority members. The requirement of a two-thirds vote ensures that bills considered by this method have bipartisan support and are non-controversial.

In contrast, the procedure provided by House Resolution 168, in which only a three-fifths vote is required for passage, means that bills will not necessarily require bipartisan support. Members should be reminded that, during 4 of the last 10 Congresses, one party held three-fifths of the seats in the House.

If bills considered under the corrections procedure are not allowed to be amended—other than by an amendment by the committee of jurisdiction and through a motion to recommit—then they should meet the same test for bipartisanship, and lack of controversy, that is imposed on bills considered under the suspension process.

The right to offer amendments is important to all Members, but it is particularly significant to minority members because it provides the opposition party its best opportunity for meaningful involvement during floor consideration of a bill. I would hope that our colleagues on the other side—most of whom had the opportunity to serve here in the minority—would give serious thought to this matter. Those who do will surely agree that it would be a mistake for the House to abandon its longstanding protection of minority floor rights by requiring anything less than the approval of two-thirds of the House to waive those rights.

We also find it troubling that Members are being asked to approve a change in the rules of the House for a class of legislation before we have a clear understanding of what corrections bills are, and why they require a separate and distinct floor procedure for consideration. Neither the resolution itself, nor the accompanying report, defines a corrections bill; there has been no explanation of how the correction process will work before a committee reports a bill; and we have yet to receive an explanation of what roles the leadership, the corrections advisory group, committees and individual Members will play in this process.

Until information on those matters is provided, we believe it is unwise for the House to act on any measure establishing an unusual legislative procedure for considering corrections bills, particularly when the procedure vests all authority to determine which bills qualify for it in one person, the Speaker.

We believe that if the House is going to establish a new expedited procedure, then the minority party should have a formal role in determining which measures may be brought up under it, as it does in determining the scheduling of bills under suspension of the rules. In such cases, the Republican conference rules themselves require the approval of the minority.

When the Speaker testified before a joint hearing of the Rules Committee and the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, he said—repeatedly—that he wanted the corrections process to be bipartisan. In fact, he stated emphatically that “if this is going to work, it has to be bipartisan.”

That was on May 2. Some time between that date and June 6, when this resolution was introduced, the Corrections Day proposal took a wrong turn. Despite the Speaker's strong bid for a bipartisan process, Corrections Day became a highly partisan matter. No minority members were involved in the development of the proposed procedure or any aspect of the corrections process; no minority members were added to the initial corrections steering group; and the minority leader was—until just today as we understand it—unable to secure assurances that the minority party will be able to select its own members for the corrections advisory group, as has been the longstanding tradition in the House for appointments to committees and all other formal bipartisan panels.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEILENSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has just said that the minority leader has had no input. I do believe that Speaker GINGRICH has received a letter appointing those Members from your side of the aisle. The gentleman really should correct his statement to that effect.

Mr. BEILENSON. The gentleman, reclaiming his time, has corrected his statement. The gentleman has said, and I will quote him:

No minority Members were involved in the development of the proposed procedure or any aspect of the corrections process; no minority Members were added to the initial corrections steering group; and the minority leader was—until just today as we understand it—unable to secure assurances that the minority party will be able to select its own Members for the corrections advisory group.

I think what the gentleman from California said was absolutely correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. Just for clarification, the minority leader has appointed the minority members.

Mr. BEILENSON. As of today, we understand that is correct. But we have had no part to play in the development of this process from the beginning.

We think that the existing suspension process would be sufficient for the consideration of corrections bills, and we urge the majority to try using this process before establishing this new procedure.

Alternatively, we proposed changing the three-fifths margin for passage of corrections bills to two-thirds. We also asked that a motion to recommit be permitted during consideration of corrections bills. And, we proposed requiring the minority leader's concurrence to place bills on the Corrections Calendar.

We also asked that appointments to the corrections advisory group—which is expected to play a pivotal role in the corrections process—be made in the same manner as appointments are made to other formal bipartisan panels, with the minority members chosen by their leadership. And, we asked that the bipartisan leadership define corrections bills, and issue guidelines for the corrections process, before using the Corrections Calendar.

We offered these proposals not only to safeguard minority rights, but also to protect the integrity of the legislative process in the House. Unfortunately, except for the inclusion of a motion to recommit, and now the acquiescence and the approval of the minority leader in appointing Members to the advisory committee, our proposals were rejected by the majority members of the committee. Actually, a provision for a motion to recommit had to be added, because otherwise the resolution would have violated the Rules of the House.

It is unfortunate that the proponents of this rule change decided to follow a path of partisanship in this matter, rather than accept our modest suggestions which would have ensured broad—if not unanimous—support for the corrections process, and which would have kept the process in the same bipartisan spirit in which the Speaker first offered it.

However, it is not too late to turn this proposal into a procedure that will be embraced by Members of both parties. If the previous question is defeated, we shall offer an amendment to change the three-fifths vote requirement for corrections bills to two-thirds. With a two-thirds vote requirement, we will have the assurance that, regardless of which party is in power, the rights of the minority will be as well protected for purposes of considering corrections bills—however they turn out to be defined—as they are for any other legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we urge our colleagues to oppose House Resolution 168 in its current form.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the gentleman's comments regard-

ing the amendment we offered and adopted to permit a motion to recommit with instructions on corrections bills.

The fact is that it was only after we decided to offer this amendment that it came to our attention that House rules prohibit the Rules Committee from denying a motion to recommit—even in a House rule change such as this. We had thought it only applied to special order resolutions.

However, we did not have to include the language “with or without instructions.” We included that language voluntarily to guarantee the minority's right to offer a final amendment in a motion to recommit, even if a committee substitute has been adopted.

Ordinarily, such a substitute would block further amendments in a motion to recommit.

So, my only point is that we overcame a problem even before we knew it was a problem; and we solved it by going further than we had to do to protect the minority's rights.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], one of the most important Members of this Congress in bringing about reform, and vice chairman of the Committee on Rules, which I have the privilege of chairing.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend the gentleman from Glens Falls, distinguished chairman of the committee, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent that we have an opportunity to deal with what the Speaker has accurately described as a corrections day, to face some of the most ridiculous, preposterous regulations the Federal Government has imposed on the American people and get rid of them. But the Speaker was right when he, on May 2, testified before the joint hearing that was held by the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House Committee on Rules, and the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight that dealt with this issue, when he said it should be done in a bipartisan way.

Let me say to my friend from Woodland Hills and to others on the other side of the aisle that, as we have gone through this process, I have been working very closely with my colleagues to ensure that minority rights are not ignored. Let me underscore that again. Minority rights are very important.

I have served in this House as a Member of the minority. I am much happier serving as a Member of the majority but I think, having served as a Member of the minority, I am very sensitive to the concerns the minority has raised, and I believe the Speaker was very sincere when he said we should do this in a bipartisan way.

So what have we done? Well, the Corrections Calendar procedure does call for, as my friend said just a few moments ago, the minority leader to appoint the minority members, and he is right, it was just done recently, but the fact of the matter is those Members have been appointed by the minority leader.

This measure requires a three-fifths vote for passage. It requires the Speaker to consult with the minority leader

before placing bills on the Corrections Calendar. It requires that all measures placed on the Corrections Calendar be favorably reported by a committee and placed on the House or Union Calendar. It does not waive points of order against measures called up on the Corrections Calendar, and as my friend knows, I offered an amendment in the Committee on Rules which was adopted in a bipartisan way which allows minority amendments through a motion to recommit with amendatory instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is going to deal with these onerous regulations and at the same time recognize minority rights. We should have support all the way across the board.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

(Mr. WAXMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise with regret to express my opposition to the proposed Corrections Day Calendar.

I strongly support the idea of correcting truly silly regulations. But I fear that the new corrections procedure we are considering will become a fast track for special interests to stop regulations that protect public health and the environment.

My concern is not hypothetical. We have already seen many examples this Congress of special interest fixes being described as "corrections."

Consider the recent actions of the House Budget Committee report. Last month, the Budget Committee identified over 50 regulations in its budget report that it said are "the most expensive and onerous and appear ripe for termination or reform." Unfortunately, the Budget Committee's list wasn't limited to expensive and onerous regulations that truly need correction. Instead, it included many regulations whose correction would enrich special interests at the expense of public health.

One example involves the tobacco industry. This industry is the Nation's biggest special interest. During the last election cycle alone, the tobacco industry gave \$2 million in soft money to the Republican Party.

This powerful special interest is an enormous beneficiary of the corrections proposed by the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee recommends that Congress—and I quote—"rescind enforcement of laws regarding cigarette sales to minors"—Budget Report at page 171. The committee also recommends that Congress prevent OSHA from regulating exposure to environmental tobacco smoke—a known human lung carcinogen.

I cannot support a new corrections process that could be used by the tobacco industry to increase their cigarette sales to children.

The tobacco companies are by no means the only special interest that is likely to benefit from the new process.

The Budget Committee also recommends that we stop the Department of Agriculture from finalizing its regulations to modernize meat inspections. These regulations are estimated to save thousands of lives and prevent millions of illnesses each year. Yet they are put in jeopardy by the rule changes we are considering today.

Other examples of regulations that the Budget Committee wants to correct include:

The Clean Air Act requirements that sources of toxic emissions monitor and report their emissions.

The requirements that cars meet minimum fuel-efficiency standards.

Key requirements to clean up drinking water.

The regulations implementing the motor-voter law.

We must not adopt a corrections process that would make it easier for special interests to subvert the legislative process and achieve goals like those proposed by the Budget Committee. Unfortunately, I am afraid that the proposal before us will have exactly this result.

□ 1145

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I just have to point out, and I would point out to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], we just heard the previous speaker. Now, I understand that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is going to appoint the previous speaker to this task force. You have heard his attitude. The gentleman thinks this whole corrections concept is silly and absurd.

Can you imagine how constructive the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] is going to be in trying to get corrections bills for regulations that I consider silly and ludicrous? The gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. COLLIN PETERSON, has been denied the right to have these votes on the floor in the past.

That is why the minority leader cannot be given a veto right. We would never get any of these silly and dumb rules out onto the floor for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Reno, NV, Mrs. BARBARA VUCANOVICH, the chairwoman of the task force, who has done such an outstanding job of putting together this corrections calendar concept.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking Chairman SOLOMON for his invaluable help in putting together this historic rules change we are considering today. Without his support and guidance this House would not be about to launch this important initiative.

I also want to thank the Speaker for allowing me to chair the steering committee on Corrections Day. It has been an honor to work on this important project.

This is a historic day. For the first time the Congress is going to implement a plan for eliminating ridiculous Federal rules and regulations. For the first time this House is going to make

it a priority to relieve average citizens of regulatory excess.

There are 100 million words of Federal regulations on the books today, and it is growing by the thousands each and every day.

The truth of the matter is—no one can possibly comply with all these rules and no one can possibly enforce them all. We have to do something to turn the tide.

This is not an attempt at wholesale repeal of health and safety laws, or environmental regulation.

We all agree, some regulation is necessary. But you can't tell me that there aren't just a few of those 100 million words of regulation that we can live without.

During this debate we are going to hear a lot about the corrections process being unnecessary or unfair to the minority.

These issues are minor when compared to the important task we are undertaking.

We have come up with the most fair and workable plan to handle corrections. I urge Members to support this resolution and strike the first blow against stupid regulations.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this change in the House rules to establish special new procedures for a Corrections Day, which has been billed as an opportunity to pass simple bills that correct mistakes in laws, or correct regulations that go far beyond what Congress intended.

The Speaker has indicated that these bills should enjoy bipartisan support, and that they would correct silly results of previous laws.

At a joint hearing of subcommittees of the Rules Committee and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, on which I serve as ranking minority member, there was bipartisan agreement that corrections bills could serve a useful purpose, if handled properly. No one should believe, therefore, that any Member opposes efforts to establish a corrections day to modify laws that don't make sense.

Unfortunately, House Resolution 168 would rig the playing field to the advantage of the majority for these supposedly noncontroversial bills. This resolution would allow corrections bills to go to the floor at the sole discretion of the Speaker under rules that permit no amendments and require just a three-fifths vote.

The common procedure of the House for noncontroversial bills is the Suspension Calendar. Those bills require a two-thirds vote for passage. Many bills that were passed with a two-thirds vote will not require just a three-fifths vote for correcting. This is illogical. If we require a two-thirds vote to pass a bill

under suspension of the rules, it should take a two-thirds vote to correct it.

The question is why are the Republicans not comfortable using the two-thirds majority already established for suspension votes. The obvious answer is that they feel quite certain that they can muster 261 votes, but are not certain that they can get the 290 votes that would be needed if two-thirds were required.

Since the difference between the proposed procedure for a correction bill and a bill brought up under a rule is the ban on amendments, it appears that the Republican majority is reneging on its pledge of fewer rules that prohibit amendments. Corrections bills under House Resolution 168 would not be amendable, and unlike suspension procedures, require just a three-fifths vote. There is an inconsistency here.

The other problem presented by the proposed Corrections Day procedure is the lack of any definition of a correction. Under the proposed change of the House rules, the Speaker would be the sole arbiter. At our hearing regarding the establishment of Corrections Day, we got a glimpse into the Republicans' view of mistakes that need corrections.

The list ranged from EPA monitoring requirements under the Safe Drinking Water Act to the Federal Trade Commission review of the Nestle purchase of Alpo Pet Food.

CORRECTION INVENTORY

1. FAA landfills and airports.
2. Fish and wildlife, Back Bay wildlife access.
3. Defense logistics surplus DOD property, humanitarian assist. program, foreign military sales.
4. Federal Trade Commission, Nestle purchase of Alpo Pet Food.
5. Federal Highway Admin., P.L. 100-418, metric measurements.
6. Dept. of Education 1992 Higher Educ. Act State Postsecondary review entities.
7. Private pension law reform, IRS Code revisions to provide designed base safe harbors.
8. EPA, rainfall overflow of sanitary sewer systems.
9. State covert auditing of emission test vendors, 40 CFR 51.363(a)(4).
10. Individuals With Disabilities Act revisions: 1. Apply Federal Administrative Procedures Act; 2. State option to combine idea fund with other Fed. funds; 3. Authority for States to use 10 percent of idea funds for non-categorical supports and services for children with disabilities; 4. State ability to use simplified application for local education agencies.
11. Clean Air Act, employee commute options State compliance.
12. ISTEA requirement of recycled rubber for paving.
13. EPA penalties for standards not yet announced.
14. Safe Drinking Water Act, EPA requirement for State monitoring of 25 contaminants.
15. Title V permit fees under Clean Air Act not counted as match for Federal grants.
16. IRS and SSA requirement that States verify asset-income information.
17. Home and community-based services eligibility for employment services.
18. State supplementary payments for SSI recipients.
19. Federal community mental health services block grant planning requirements.

20. Justice Dept. substance abuse RFP's require notice of funds available.

21. Title IV-E client eligibility requirements for AFDC.

22. Religious Freedom Restoration Act required religious services for any and all religions in State prisons.

23. CDBG requirements too burdensome for small communities.

24. Federal Management Improvement Act requirement that States pay interest on Federal funds.

25. Dept. of Labor should not prohibit coverage bank costs related to unemployment insurance taxes.

26. FUTA and SSA require State to withhold tax from unemployment.

27. Take Federal unemployment trust fund off budget.

28. Amend Fair Employment Standards Act to prevent absurd rulings for law enforcement agencies.

29. Streamline data collection for Federal education programs.

30. Amend Single Audit Act to require audits for grants in greater amounts.

31. 50 CFR 930, requires agencies to review competence and physical qualifications of all employees who operate vehicles.

32. OSHA requirement of four member fire-fighting crews.

Corrections Day could very easily become Special Interest Protection Day. The voices of those special interests are far more likely to propose the opening of regulatory and tax loopholes than closing them.

In order to set the Corrections Day Calendar, the Speaker has established yet another task force—this one to review corrections legislation.

When the House voted in January to eliminate three committees, and to reduce committee staffs by a third, surely it was not intended that their work be done by task forces. We do not need more task forces any more than we need new Government agencies.

These partisan task forces are not governed by any rules. In this particular case, the Corrections Day task force could become a group before which special interests will come to plead their case out of the view of the public. We saw a similar problem with the Competitiveness Council chaired by Vice President Quayle, where big businesses that failed before agencies went to the Council to plead their cases in private. It is wrong for the party that proclaimed its new Sunshine in Committee rules on the first day of Congress to be using task forces that operate in the dark behind closed doors.

Despite the call in Contract With America for fewer closed rules and fewer House committees, this proposal would result in more closed rules and more House committees, renamed task forces.

Just last week I was successful in offering an important amendment to retain full and open competition in procurement. It was a close vote, but after the vote the House passed the underlying procurement amendment by a near unanimous vote. However, if the Speaker decided that Chairman CLINGER'S procurement bill were a correction of previous procurement laws, I

would not have been able to offer the amendment, and small businesses and the taxpayers would have suffered. This is wrong.

There is a simple solution that Members of both sides of the aisle could easily endorse: Require a two-thirds vote for a correction bill rather than the proposed three-fifths vote. That would be consistent with the vote required for a bill on the Suspension Calendar. If a bill is unlikely to get a two-thirds vote, then bring it up under normal procedures, where a simple majority is required, but amendments are permitted. Unfortunately, the only way we can amend these proposed procedures is to defeat the previous question on this resolution. Then, in a bipartisan manner, we can adopt the Corrections Day procedures. Let me remind my colleagues, if the House could pass the Contract With America in 100 days, there is no need to rig the playing field for the benefit of noncontroversial bills.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thought it was really out of place and I resented the fact that there was a personal attack on me by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. The gentleman did not address the issues I raised on why this bill is going to be a vehicle for special interest.

I would like to have a corrections day to correct silly regulations, but I do not want a vehicle, which I fear this will be, to give special interests an opportunity to get a return on their investment in the candidacies of a lot of people that are in power in this institution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just assure the previous speaker that because of the deep respect I have for the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] I would never personally attack him. And I am sorry if the gentleman thought I did.

Nevertheless, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], one of the most outstanding members of the Committee on Rules, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislation and Budget Process of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 168, legislation which is designed to respond to the plea of the American people that the Federal Government become more responsive and more attuned to common sense.

One of the worst byproducts of our overblown Government and the cumbersome bureaucracy that it has

spawned over the years is that often good intentions lead to bad, or just plain dumb, rules or regulations upon implementation. That is what happens, unfortunately, when you try to enforce too many centralized, one-size-fits-all requirements on the diverse communities and individuals that make up this great country.

Government is not the answer to every problem that comes along and it never was intended to be so. Like so many good and creative ideas, the proposal for corrections day arose because of discussions with ordinary citizens and with State and local officials who for years have labored under the rigid, onerous, and at times downright absurd requirements of the Federal Government.

It is our intent, through this procedural change, to find a way to cut through the redtape and inertia and allow for speedy, narrowly focused action in addressing those problems. It is the old principle of feedback, some call it representative government, when the Federal Government hands down an ill-advised or misdirected requirement and the folks at the other end of the mandate cry out for relief. The corrections day procedure provides for a rapid-response means to receive that message through the static and tune out the problem quickly.

There were concerns raised by my friends on the other side of the aisle that this proposal could be abused and would not protect the rights of the minority. I shared that concern on the Committee on Rules and was pleased that our Committee on Rules, under Chairman SOLOMON's leadership, adopted an amendment by my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] to afford the minority its traditional right to a motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

I think that, coupled with the Speaker's public pledge to seek bipartisan corrections proposals, should allay those concerns of the minority. The abuse that we should be most worried about is the abuse that for years has allowed unnecessary, burdensome and counterproductive rules to weigh down the productivity and the individual freedoms of Americans and American institutions.

□ 1200

That is the relief we are after here today, and while some in opposition have questioned whether Republicans have got exactly the right formula, I think we do have a formula that will get the job done, and I am delighted to urge support for approval of this effort. I urge a "yes" vote as we go into this.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

(Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support House Resolution 168.

I am a cosponsor of this resolution, in spite of the fact that it is not everything that some of us wanted. Some of us actually wanted a tougher process than we have got in this resolution. But I do think it moves us in the right direction.

There is bipartisan support for this process, and I am glad to be able to serve as part of this corrections day task force that is being set up.

As I say, there are a number of Democrats on our side that think that we need to do something about overly burdensome Federal regulations. I was not really too involved in all of this regulatory process until I got looking at this moratorium bill that was introduced early on this session and got to reading some of the regulations that were promulgated and were of concern in this moratorium. What I found out is there were 615 regulations adopted in just a month and a half, and I sat down and read all of those 615, and if every Member of Congress would sit down and read every regulation, we would be in a lot better shape in this Congress, and we maybe would not need bills like this.

But the other thing that I found is that there are 204 volumes of Federal regulations, and if you sat down and read those regulations 40 hours a week, it would take you 8 years to read all of the Federal regulations that we have promulgated over the last number of years.

I do not think that there is anybody that understands everything that is in all of these regulations. I really think that what we need is a requirement that every Member of Congress read every rule and every regulation, and that would be the best thing that we could do.

We are working on some other bills. We have a sunset bill which will help, if we could get that passed, that would say we are going to look at every regulation, and we are going to sunset those that are no longer necessary.

We thought in the House that the moratorium would help, that we would have a timeout on regulations to look at the process. I think the 45-day legislative veto that the Senate is proposing will help. Again, I am not sure how much good it will do, but it will clearly put more focus.

I think this Corrections Day process will clearly help us in changing this regulatory process, because what it will do, in my opinion, it will focus Members and focus the public's attention on this regulatory process which, in my judgment, has really gotten out of hand.

I want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], and the subcommittee that I serve on for kind of making it a priority of that subcommittee to do oversight on the regulatory process. We have traveled to a number of areas in the country and listened to ordinary citizens and their reactions to some of the regulatory overburden. And as I

understand it, the chairman is going to continue that process so that we are going to have oversight on the regulatory process, and that is going to help, as well.

I also want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for being with us on these issues, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], and others.

So I just want to say that there are a number of Democrats that are concerned about the regulatory process. We have been working where we can to have a reasonable response to the overregulation that we have seen in this country, and the truth is that we should write, in my judgment, legislation more specifically so we would not have so much rulemaking, that we should read every rule that comes out, and, lastly, that we should pass this Corrections Day bill because it will move us in the right direction.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Warren, PA [Mr. CLINGER], the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, who has been very much involved in this.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

At the outset, I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota for his courage and his tenacity in reading 615 regulations. I think that is some sort of a Guinness world record I suspect he should be submitted for.

I take your point if we read more of these things, we might be a little more sensitive to the fact that we are overburdening vast portions of our economy with needless regulations. So I would rise in support of the resolution. It is well thought out, I think, and it provides a deliberative means to implement Corrections Days as suggested by our Speaker.

Corrections Day is a new and innovative approach to fixing longstanding Washington problems, and by establishing a Corrections Day calendar we have an opportunity to highlight and fix in an expedited manner laws, policies or regulations that simply do not make much sense, that are unnecessary, outdated, or over reaching. We will really have a chance in this exercise to reinvent Government, not just by talking about it but by taking concrete steps to make it more reasonable and efficient.

It is also an opportunity for us to put a call out to all Americans that not only are we serious about changing Government but to enlist their help in identifying corrections.

We need to start down this road as quickly as possible because there is clearly a lot in this city that needs correcting.

I would also state that I know the concerns of the minority about the possible abuse of this proposed new process, and I would hope that that would

not be the case. My sense of Corrections Day is that these are going to be items that we can universally agree on in a bipartisan manner, that these are stupid and these are things that should be corrected. I do not anticipate that this is going to be used as a partisan club to accomplish things but, rather, it will be done in a very bipartisan and cooperative effort to ensure that only those things that are clearly egregious and clearly outrageous will be affected.

We did have in the joint hearing held by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Committee on Rules in May, at that time both members and witnesses had the opportunity to share their thoughts about how we should be establishing Corrections Day, and it was a very bipartisan effort, and I think there is a general agreement that this is something that is needed in this climate.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, as a committee chairman, one of the concerns that I expressed at that time was how these legislative proposals would fit into the committee structure and whether committees would be bypassed in the process, and in many cases, use of the committee provides the opportunity for stakeholders to participate in the process.

House Resolution 168 addresses this concern by providing for committee consideration of all Corrections Day legislation and that allays the concerns I had about shortcircuiting the committee process. At the same time, many of us do appreciate the expedited floor procedures provided in this resolution. House rules, as we all know, can be cumbersome.

This is a sound, balanced, very well thought-out means to implement Corrections Day. The new calendar affords us the opportunity to rid ourselves of Washington policies, regulations and procedures, that just do not make sense, in many cases are just plain dumb.

So, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this procedure for Corrections Day.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is going to sanction the creation of the mother and the father of all closed rules.

Very frankly, there is a mechanism to bring matters of this kind to the floor quickly. It is called suspension of the rules. It requires a two-thirds vote. Virtually nothing else is present in this legislation which is not available to the leadership at this time under the process known as suspension of the rules.

All of us favor the idea that something should be done about dumb regulations and, like others, I have been extremely critical of legislation and regulation which has not worked in the

broad public interest and which has, in fact, been counterproductive because it did not address the problems with which we are properly concerned.

The practical effect of the rule change which we are undergoing at this particular minute is to confer on the Speaker the ability to put a piece of legislation on the floor which will be considered under 1 hour's time, with no amendments permitted except that which either the chairman or the leadership wants to take place. It will foreclose thereby all meaningful amendments which are not concurred in by the leadership, foreclose all meaningful debate because clearly any piece of legislation can be brought to the floor under this rule change. It can involve massive termination of programs. It can involve termination of agencies in Government such as the Department of Commerce, Department of Education, Department of Defense, Department of Energy. It can involve termination of programs such as welfare or air pollution or water pollution or the Food and Drug Administration or legislation which would protect the consumers or the Federal Trade Commission or any other piece of legislation which could probably be brought here under an open rule, affording more adequate and proper debate and affording adequate opportunity to amend and to discuss amendments.

In short, as I have indicated, this is the mother and the father of all closed rules. It confers on the Speaker the opportunity to pass legislation without consideration of amendments and without more than 1 hour's debate on something like 261 Members of this body. This is not something which is going to lead to good legislative practice. It is not something which is significantly expanding the authority of the leadership to do anything other than one thing, and that is to curb debate, to curb amendments, and to do so with less than two-thirds now required, only requiring three-fifths.

Now, it should be noted in the 5 of the previous 10 Congresses, 10 out of the previous 20 years, from 1975 to 1994, one party controlled over 60 percent of the seats. This is clearly a bad proposal, and no fancy language or discussion of wrongdoing is going to change that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Jackson, NM [Mr. ZELIFF], another member of the task force appointed by Speaker GINGRICH, a very valuable Member of this body.

Mr. ZELIFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time.

I rise today in the strongest support for this change to the House rules. Corrections Day is a revolutionary idea for this Congress, and it deserves a special place, along with the Contract With

America, in changing the way we do business. Back in November the voters made their feelings clear about their dissatisfaction with the way this House of Representatives operates. Republicans came to the majority as part of a revolution for change. These old ways of doing business are over.

In just the past 6 months we have changed the way Washington works. Corrections Day is a natural step in this Republican revolution for change.

There is just no way that we can continue to operate under the systems of the 1950's. This is 1995, and we live in a society which demands immediate action to correct the onslaught of Federal regulations which enter into every American's everyday life.

Corrections Day serves as one way for this Congress to begin to relieve those threats to liberty, clean out some of the legislative deadwood that has accumulated around here for the last 40 years, and to do it quickly and effectively, and it all comes with change.

Today we are hearing argument after argument from the other side about fairness to the minority and how Corrections Day will trample their rights. What we hear, ladies and gentlemen, is the voice of the status quo and the voice of denial. They are not concerned with minority rights. We have gone to great lengths to insure the rights of the minority by allowing motions to recommit, requiring consultation with the minority on all corrections requiring a three-fifths' vote to assure these bills pass on a bipartisan basis, which, by the way, will require strong Democratic support.

Corrections Day allows us to finally have an effective tool to get rid of the most ridiculous, outrageous, dumb ideas, laws, rules, regulations which now plague the future of our country. With Corrections Day, we can make these changes without having to go through an entire reauthorization of legislation which will take months.

We have been very deliberate to assure nothing could reach the floor as a correction without first going through the committee process, since their Members are the experts on these subjects. Corrections Day is a new idea with a strong potential to change the way that this Congress does business.

I thank the Speaker for coming up with a great idea. I commend the Committee on Rules for their fine work, and I look forward to this Congress becoming more efficient in the way we run our country's business.

This is a private sector idea. It is a time where we start looking at more efficient ways to do our business.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

(Mr. MINETA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, one of the responsibilities of any legislature has

always been to correct features of previously enacted bills when appropriated to do so, and to correct actions taken by the executive pursuant to legislative authority when the legislature believes that the executive action is unwise or unwarranted. Such legislative corrections have been part of this Congress' activity for almost as long as there has been a Congress.

What has been proposed more recently is that we have a special Corrections Calendar, to highlight and expedite the corrections legislating that we have long done. House Resolution 168 would amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create such a calendar, to empower the Speaker to decide which of all the bills placed on the other calendars of the House should be placed also on the new Corrections Calendar, and to allow the bills on the new Correction Calendar to be considered without amendment and to pass by a three-fifths vote.

There is nothing wrong with the idea of creating a separate Corrections Calendar, and there is nothing wrong with trying to expedite Congress' longstanding efforts to correct what needs to be corrected in existing law or in executive branch action.

The Speaker testified before the Government Reform and Oversight Committee that the purpose of a new legislative procedure for corrections should be to deal with issues which obviously warrant corrections and for which the correction enjoys broad bipartisan support and is not controversial. That is exactly the kind of corrections legislation which should have an expedited procedure so the correction can be accomplished quickly.

I, therefore, support, and I believe most Members would support, an expedited Corrections Calendar for corrections bills which enjoy broad bipartisan support and which are not controversial.

Unfortunately, that is not what House Resolution 168 would do. The effect of this resolution would be to allow any bill, whether it was a corrections bill or any other bill, to be taken up under procedures which would bar amendments from the floor of the House, and it would make it easier than it has ever been to do that.

Nothing in this resolution would prevent this or any future Speaker from putting a bill which was not a corrections bill at all on the Corrections Calendar.

At present we have a Suspension Calendar, designed to expedite consideration of smaller, noncontroversial bills. A bill on the Suspension Calendar may be considered without amendments from the floor, but it must achieve a two-thirds vote in order to pass. That two-thirds vote has been the high standard for routinely barring amendments—a bill had to be sufficiently noncontroversial that it could pass by a two-thirds vote in order to be considered under procedures which barred amendments. What House Reso-

lution 168 would do, for the first time, is create a procedure by which amendments could be routinely barred from bills which could only get a three-fifths vote.

In other words, the sole effect of this resolution would be to make it easier to bar amendments to bills which are not sufficiently noncontroversial and bipartisan to get the two-thirds vote.

The sole power to decide what would be placed on the Corrections calendar would be in the hands of one person—the Speaker of the House. By virtue of being on that calendar all unfriendly amendments would be barred. It would thus be the power of the Speaker alone to decide whether a bill being considered under procedures barring all amendments would have to meet the two-thirds test or the three-fifths test. The Speaker alone would have the power to adjust for each bill the standard of what it takes to pass a bill while preventing amendments from being offered.

The difference between two-thirds and three fifths in the House is the difference between 290 votes and 261 votes. What this resolution is all about is giving the Speaker the sole power to decide whether any bill needs 290 votes to be considered under provisions barring amendments, or whether it needs only 261 votes to be considered under those procedures.

That is a lot of power to give any individual. It is the power for 1 Member to negate the votes of 29 other Members. It is a degree of power that we should not give to any one Member of this House, whether Speaker or not, whether a Member of one party or the other, whether a past, present, or future Member.

This is not a power anyone needs who simply wants to pass bills which are broadly bipartisan and noncontroversial.

This is a device for stifling alternative points of view, for preventing full and open consideration of alternatives, for keeping opposing ideas out of the public debate, for making it easier for some Members to avoid votes and public accountability on tough issues.

If what we wanted was a Corrections Calendar which offered an expedited procedure for noncontroversial bills, we would use the same two-thirds requirement we have always had for the Suspension Calendar.

I would urge Members to oppose the previous question so that an amendment can be offered which would keep the idea of a Corrections Calendar, but would also retain the present practice of requiring a two-thirds vote to pass bills under procedures barring all amendments. Let us make Corrections Day what the Speaker said he wanted, an opportunity to pass broadly bipartisan and noncontroversial bills, not an opportunity to make it easier to exclude amendments from bills which are controversial.

□ 1215

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, Vice President Dan Quayle came under a lot of criticism for speaking up for family values. It turns out he was so right; was he not?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

(Mr. MCINTOSH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, let me say I think this change in the rules today is one of the critically important reforms that we are making in this House of Representatives not to cater to special interests, but to actually cater to what the American people want us to do, and that is to correct the problems that have grown up over 25 years of big government, increasing regulation and burdens that in many cases just simply do not make any sense. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON], the ranking member on my subcommittee, indicated that we had traveled to many places and held field hearings where we actually listened to people and the problems that they have with the Federal Government. Let me report to my colleagues some of the things we heard.

In Muncie, Kay Whitehead, who is a farmer who has a pork production facility, has to get rid of the waste product of that pork production facility. She needs to spread it on her fields as manure. One agency tells her to spread it on top of the fields. Another agency tells her, no, to plow it into the fields. She does not care what she does, but she needs to have guidance from the Government. We need to correct that so she knows one way or the other she is following the law.

The city of Richmond came in and testified they have a paraplegic van to help people who are handicapped in their transportation network. They also have eight city buses. They are now required under the Americans With Disabilities Act to expend over \$100,000 in changing those buses to make them handicapped accessible. The problem is in the last 3 years they have only had one person who would need that new facility. Everybody else uses the vans that they make available to them.

In Maine we heard from the city that had to spend millions of dollars in correcting their sewage treatment facility. They have an excellent record of protecting the environment there. This money was not needed. They could have done it in a much cheaper way, but Federal regulations were imposing those costs.

Firefighters wrote to me and said, "You know, in a small town we have difficulty getting four firefighters to the fire at the same time, but OSHA has a regulation saying that we can't go in and start fighting the fire until all four of us are there. What do you

want us to do? Stand on the sides letting the building burn." Another stupid regulation that needs to be corrected.

Finally we heard about a new guideline came out from a Federal agency to builders saying in new homes we have to have a different type of toilet. It cannot be the regular toilet with a full tank of water to flush. It has to be a smaller tank so that one would only use a small amount of water. The problem is the way the Federal Government designs these toilets, they do not have enough water to flush the drain. Everybody flushes twice and ends up using more water and undermining the whole goal of this regulation. This is a rule that should just be flushed down the toilet. Let people know what they need to do, and let them design the solution for themselves.

Let me close by saying that I think the genius of Speaker GINGRICH's proposal here is that he has reversed the incentives. As Members of Congress we can now come forward with solutions to correct these problems, have a calendar that will let us do it. It is a bipartisan initiative. It will let us have a process that will let us flush these old rules down the drain.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House, there was a time once upon a time when committees of Congress had the power to veto stupid regulations. That power was taken away from us by the Supreme Court when it ruled that the right to regulate under any statute we create belonged to the agency, the executive agency. We can no longer veto regulations that we have authorized in legislation. The President of the United States can veto bills, but he cannot veto regulations, and, worse than that, the Supreme Court ruled, that if an agency wanted to change a regulation, get rid of a regulation, it has to go through the same process it used to create that regulation in order to get rid of it.

What we have got in America is a situation where the bureaucrats have more power than the legislature and more power than the President himself under our Constitution. A day like Corrections Day makes sense. It is a day when we in Congress can do what the Supreme Court says we ought to do, be a little more careful when we write laws, what we allow people to regulate, a day for us to correct those mistakes in a legal, constitutional way.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 168 that would establish the Correction Calendar to expedite the repeal of outdated, unnecessary, and ridiculous laws

and regulations. The need for such a Correction Calendar is readily apparent, has been for some time. Whether it is a rule that was irrational and unnecessarily burdensome to begin with or a law that has outlived whatever usefulness it may have had, the time has come to provide a mechanism to correct these regulatory and statutory errors.

Mr. Speaker, I think that not only is this an opportunity for us to repeal regulations that fit that characterization, but it will also have a very salutary effect upon the agencies that write the regulations in the first part, and, second, I think it is likely to cause our constituents to give us their ideas repeatedly about regulations that do not seem to be too rational in their effect, and I think we are going to hear from our constituents, and they are going to have greater hope that we in the Government, the legislative branch, will be able to do something about inappropriate regulations.

Mr. Chairman, this Member rises in support of House Resolution 168, which would establish a Corrections Calendar to expedite the repeal of outdated, unnecessary and ridiculous laws and regulations. The need for such a Corrections Calendar is readily apparent. Whether it is a rule that was irrational and unnecessarily burdensome to begin with or a law that has outlived whatever usefulness it may have had, the time has come to provide a mechanism to correct these regulatory and statutory errors.

Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to highlight two examples of regulations which cry out for inclusion on the Corrections Calendar. The first is the DOT hours-of-service regulation as it applies to farmers and farm suppliers. The need to repeal this regulation is obvious—each year farmers and their suppliers must be prepared to move quickly and work long hours at planting and harvest time when the weather permits. During certain weeks of the year, there is a small window of opportunity in the crop-planting and harvesting season when the demand for farm supplies escalates. Unfortunately, this demand runs headlong into the Department of Transportation's regulations for the number of hours a driver can be on duty.

DOT's hours-of-service regulations are highly impractical, burdensome, and costly for farmers and farm suppliers because the law can require them to take 3 days off—at the peak of agricultural production—and wait in order to accumulate enough off-duty time to resume driving. This is because DOT regulations define on duty time as "all time from the time a driver begins work or is required to be in readiness to work until the time he/she is relieved from work." Of course DOT could correct this problem by a change in regulations but they are performing like an unyielding, arrogant bureaucracy unsympathetic to the necessary problems their regulations create for the farm community.

The hours-of-service regulations are directed toward long distance truck drivers. However, they also apply to the local distribution of farm input materials even though driving is incidental to the farm supplier's principal work function of servicing farmers.

Last year, working with farm State colleagues in the House and the other body, this Member sought regulatory relief for farmers and farm suppliers from the DOT's unfair on-duty hours of service restrictions on this class of drivers and joined many Members in a letter to the DOT on this matter. Unfortunately, last year's legislative effort to provide an agricultural exemption was reduced to a mandated rulemaking which has now become a bureaucratic nightmare with no hope of regulatory relief in sight. The DOT proposed rulemaking includes a number of hurdles which will further burden farmers. This Member introduced legislation earlier this year along with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] to address this issue. Such a bill would be a perfect candidate for the first Corrections Calendar.

Second, this Member has introduced legislation to correct a badly flawed interpretation of the law by the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD]. That department has willfully flaunted congressional intent to promulgate a final regulation which burdens homeowners unnecessarily and undermines the intent of this Member to bring common sense to HUD's requirements for water purification devices in rural FHA insured properties.

This Member's legislation, H.R. 69, is identical to legislation passed by the House in the 103d Congress as section 410 of H.R. 3838, the Housing and Community Development Act of 1994, passed July 22, 1994. The need for this provision arose when HUD promulgated extremely unsatisfactory regulations to implement section 424 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987. The 1987 provision is one this Member introduced to provide for either point-of-use or point-of-entry water purification equipment in FHA insured housing. HUD's initial regulations did not allow point-of-use systems.

Despite passage of section 424 in 1987, HUD took until 1991 to promulgate an inadequate proposed rule, and the final rule was not promulgated until March 19, 1992. After taking an outrageous period of time—nearly five years—to develop a new rule, the rule that was finalized is seriously flawed. That rule requires a point-of-use system on every faucet in an FHA insured house which has a water supply not meeting HUD's water purity standards, whether the faucet is used for human consumption or for showers, washing machines, and so forth.

This Member's legislation provides that a point-of-use system is required on every faucet used primarily for human consumption thereby protecting the safety of the dweller without irrationally over-regulating at a great cost to the homeowner.

The legislation also requires that for testing water purification devices, HUD use water-purification industry accepted protocols or protocols using technically valid testing methods of the Environmental Protection Agency. This take HUD out of the business of creating environmental standards and leaves those standards to those with expertise in the area.

HUD has shown complete intractability in meeting the original intent of this Member's legislation. This is a problem which should have been solved in 1987, but instead has lingered on for over 7 years. If ever there was a candidate for a correction of bureaucratic mismanagement, this foolish regulation is it. This Member hopes that his colleagues will

lend their support to finally resolve this problem.

Mr. Chairman, these are only two examples, but they highlight the much larger problems associated with a bureaucratic Federal Government which has grown too big. This Member urges his colleagues to strike a blow for common sense and vote for the Corrections Calendar to be established by House Resolution 168.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Scottsdale, AZ [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I think what we saw on November 8 of last year was the American people saying, "Let us open the windows of this Congress, let us reform this Congress; yes, perhaps in revolutionary style, but also in a rational style. Let us have common sense returned to Government."

Mr. Speaker, that is what this legislation will do. By innovation we will be able to streamline and correct problems, outmoded regulations, outmoded laws, find a vehicle to restore rationality, and that is why I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to stand here in strong support of the legislation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mrs. WALDHOLTZ), a new Member of this House.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly support Corrections Day of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor. This bill gives Congress a sensible approach to eliminating irresponsible, nonsensical Federal regulations. Overreaching regulations impose a heavy cost on our economy and are killing small business which creates the majority of new jobs throughout our country and particularly in my home State of Utah. Each new mandate means higher costs, increased litigations, more failed businesses and fewer jobs. Government administrators currently face no explicit requirement to consider the effects of the rules that they have developed, nor have lawmakers done so in the past. Even when agencies or congressional committees have considered the effects of proposed regulations, policymakers often did so in ways that were simplistic or relied on faulty assumptions or models, and nowhere in the entire regulatory processes did anyone consider the cumulative effects of proposed and existing regulations. As part of the Contract With America we passed important regulatory reform to help Federal bureaucrats prioritize regulatory decisions ensuring that limited resources have targeted to the greatest needs, but while this was a positive step for future regulations, we still have not addressed the problems that we have with current Federal regulations.

That is why I support Corrections Day. It is not enough for us to ensure that future regulations are controlled. We need to reform the current regulatory maze. Inefficient regulation costs the American economy \$600 bil-

lion each year or more than \$5,900 per family, and Congress has been too slow to fix the problems we have inadvertently created. Corrections Day will give us the flexibility to respond quickly to correct our obvious errors and mistakes while still having the benefit of review by the committee of jurisdiction and the consensus reflected by the three-fifths requirement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the previous question and to support this bill so that we can work to free Americans from bureaucratic red-tape and help to remake our economy into the greatest job making machine in the world.

□ 1230

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say this. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] and others have spoken of regulations and laws that need changing. May I gently point out that nothing is stopping us from changing those laws and regulations right now. Nobody really has explained why we need a new procedure.

The truth of the matter is that none of this is necessary. The Speaker or anyone else can gather together any bills that he or others deem corrections bills and put them on the calendar right now and call it a corrections calendar. In fact, presumably every bill we pass around here is a correction of one sort or another, or an improvement of one kind or another on existing laws or regulations.

For the many reasons previously given, perhaps most cogently most recently by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] and others, we do oppose the proposed rules change.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to Members that the first vote will be on the previous question on the Corrections Day resolution. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If it is defeated, I shall offer an amendment to change the three-fifths vote requirement to two-thirds. With a two-thirds vote requirement, we will have the assurance, regardless of the party in power, that the minority is as well protected in the corrections process as on all other legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment I propose to offer, should the previous question not be ordered, simply reads: "On page 3, line 1, strike 'three-fifths' and insert 'two-thirds.'"

Mr. Speaker, in closing, again I urge a "no" vote on this proposed rules change.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to the Members of this body that this country had a great President not too many years ago, and his name was

Ronald Reagan. He had a unique ability to focus this entire Nation in the direction that he wanted to move it. I guess we are so very fortunate today to have a Speaker of this House who has that same unique ability to keep this Congress focused.

The big difference between the old majority controlled by the Democrats and the new majority controlled now by the Republicans is that we try to focus this Nation on the problems that have literally brought this country to a halt and that have threatened generations to come with huge deficits and huge burdens of overregulation that are heaped on not only local government but on small business in particular.

This particular resolution, by creating a corrections calendar, is going to focus the entire bureaucracy of this Government on the problems that really are facing business and industry today. By our bringing these corrections up one by one in a separate calendar, every bureaucrat inside this Beltway is going to take notice. That is the real reason for this.

So when we bring these corrections bills before the Congress, they will be relatively noncontroversial, but there will be some controversy. They will be confined to a single subject. They will not involve the expenditure of additional money or the raising of additional revenues. That is very important. These are the criteria for these kinds of legislation. They will deal with the silly, dumb, and ludicrous rules that have literally just about brought business and industry to a point where they cannot be profitable anymore. If you cannot be profitable, you cannot create a new job for all of the high school seniors, as I said before, or for the college seniors who are graduating today. This is what we are doing.

I am so excited about this. When we bring this first corrections bill to the floor, every bureaucrat in this Government is going to pay attention to what is happening and they are going to think twice before they promulgate the kinds of rules and regulations that go far beyond what the legislative intent of Congress is.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member will vote for the previous question and will vote for this change of the rules, which is going to really make a difference in this country.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of creating a calendar for the purpose of Corrections Day legislation. From the start, I've thought having regular Corrections Days would be the perfect way to deal with the myriad of rules and regulations that are unduly costly or simply make no sense.

It is particularly timely for us to be doing this now because July 9, just a couple of weeks away, is Cost of Government Day. This is the day when Americans will have earned enough money to pay off the total financial burden of government at all levels, including taxes, mandates, borrowing, and regulations. This means

that 52 cents out of every hard earned dollar are going to the government either directly or indirectly this year.

Cost of Government Day is a sad reminder that the size of government has reached unbelievable proportions.

But the 104th Congress is very different from past Congresses. Earlier this year, the House began to shrink the burden of government by passing a number of regulatory reform bills, and the Senate will soon bring similar legislation to the floor for a vote.

However, while we are making significant changes to the process by which regulations are promulgated, there is still the arguably even bigger problem of ridiculous regulations that are currently on the books and are encroaching on people's lives every day. Many of these are hard to believe:

Last year, a Houston roofing company was cited by OSHA 23 times for a grand total of \$13,200 in fines for such transgressions as a bent rung on the bottom of a ladder and a splintered handle on a broken shovel placed in the back of a truck after it had been broken.

Also last year, a 14-year-old Boy Scout was left stranded in new Mexico's Santa Fe National Forest after being lost for 2 days because the Forest Service would not allow a police helicopter to land and pick him up. It seems the boy was in a "wilderness area" in which "mechanized vehicles" are banned.

And many of you have heard of OSHA's rule requiring employers to provide detailed safety information and training regarding the use of such hazardous substances as diet soda, Joy dishwashing liquid, and chalk.

I assume the Federal Government is not intentionally trying to wreak havoc on people's lives. Nonetheless, the American people shouldn't have to continue to suffer the consequences of poorly written or poorly implemented rules and regulations.

Mr. Speaker. I say to my colleagues, Corrections Day is a real opportunity to right wrongs. All across the country, Americans are fed up with a system that is overly intrusive, unreasonable, and excessively costly.

This rules change will address one aspect of the problem and create a process by which we can repeal the most egregious, oppressive, and ridiculous regulations that this Government has promulgated.

I urge support of the Members for House Resolution 168 to create a Corrections Calendar.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I live by the old adage: If it ain't broke don't fix it. We have spent a whole lot of time and energy coming up with a way to fix a legislative process that is not the least bit broken.

I might remind my Republican colleagues that we already have a procedure for bipartisan, noncontroversial bills, it is called suspension of the rules and it would take care of everything you want to go after and allow the Democrats to join you.

But, we are not leaving well enough alone; for some reason we are changing the rules.

Mr. Republican colleagues say we need this rules change to get rid of unnecessary regulations. Although this version of the resolution is an improvement over the last version—it is still a long way from being fair to the Democrats.

If these regulations we will be ending are so silly, then why lower the vote margin from two-thirds to three-fifths?

Democrats want to get rid of silly regulations and unnecessary laws just as much as any-

one else but this process will not give us much say.

We firmly believe that there are far too many wasteful, useless provisions and it is time to eliminate them. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that Democrats can join in the corrections process.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 185, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

YEAS—236

Allard	Cubin	Hefley
Archer	Cunningham	Heineman
Armey	Davis	Henger
Bachus	DeLay	Hilleary
Baessler	Diaz-Balart	Hobson
Baker (CA)	Dickey	Hoekstra
Baker (LA)	Doolittle	Hoke
Ballenger	Dornan	Horn
Barr	Dreier	Hostettler
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Houghton
Bartlett	Dunn	Hunter
Barton	Ehlers	Hutchinson
Bass	Ehrlich	Hyde
Bateman	Emerson	Inglis
Bereuter	English	Istook
Bilbray	Ensign	Johnson (CT)
Bilirakis	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Blute	Ewing	Jones
Boehlert	Fawell	Kasich
Boehner	Fields (TX)	Kelly
Bonilla	Flanagan	Kim
Bono	Foley	King
Brownback	Forbes	Kingston
Bryant (TN)	Fowler	Klug
Bunn	Fox	Knollenberg
Bunning	Franks (CT)	Kolbe
Burr	Franks (NJ)	LaHood
Burton	Frelinghuysen	Largent
Buyer	Frisa	Latham
Callahan	Funderburk	LaTourette
Calvert	Gallegly	Laughlin
Camp	Ganske	Lazio
Canady	Gekas	Leach
Castle	Geren	Lewis (CA)
Chabot	Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)
Chambliss	Gillmor	Lightfoot
Chenoweth	Gilman	Linder
Christensen	Goodlatte	Livingston
Chrysler	Goodling	LoBiondo
Clinger	Goss	Longley
Coble	Graham	Lucas
Coburn	Greenwood	Manzullo
Collins (GA)	Gunderson	Martini
Combest	Gutknecht	McCrery
Condit	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Cooley	Hancock	McInnis
Cox	Hansen	McIntosh
Crane	Hastert	McKeon
Crapo	Hastings (WA)	Metcalf
Creameans	Hayworth	Meyers

Mica	Rogers
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher
Molinar	Ros-Lehtinen
Moorhead	Roth
Morella	Roukema
Myers	Royce
Myrick	Salmon
Nethercutt	Sanford
Neumann	Saxton
Ney	Scarborough
Norwood	Schaefer
Nussle	Schiff
Oxley	Seastrand
Packard	Sensenbrenner
Parker	Shadegg
Paxon	Shaw
Peterson (MN)	Shays
Petri	Shuster
Pombo	Skeen
Porter	Smith (MI)
Portman	Smith (NJ)
Pryce	Smith (TX)
Quillen	Smith (WA)
Quinn	Solomon
Radanovich	Souder
Ramstad	Spence
Regula	Stearns
Riggs	Stenholm
Roberts	Stockman

NAYS—185

Abercrombie	Gordon	Olver
Ackerman	Green	Ortiz
Andrews	Gutierrez	Orton
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Owens
Barcia	Hamilton	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Harman	Pastor
Beilenson	Hastings (FL)	Payne (NJ)
Bentsen	Hayes	Payne (VA)
Berman	Hefner	Pelosi
Bevill	Hilliard	Pickett
Bishop	Hinchey	Pomeroy
Bonior	Holden	Poshard
Borski	Hoyer	Rahall
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Brewster	Jacobs	Reed
Browder	Johnson (SD)	Reynolds
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Brown (OH)	Johnston	Rivers
Bryant (TX)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Cardin	Kaptur	Rose
Chapman	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Clayton	Kennelly	Sabo
Clement	Kildee	Sanders
Clyburn	Klecza	Sawyer
Coleman	Klink	Schroeder
Collins (IL)	LaFalce	Scott
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Serrano
Conyers	Levin	Siskisky
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Coyne	Lincoln	Skelton
Cramer	Lipinski	Slaughter
Danner	Lofgren	Spratt
de la Garza	Lowey	Stokes
DeFazio	Luther	Studds
DeLauro	Maloney	Stupak
Dellums	Manton	Tanner
Deutsch	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	Martinez	Tejeda
Dingell	Mascara	Thompson
Dixon	Matsui	Thornton
Doggett	McCarthy	Thurman
Dooley	McDermott	Torres
Doyle	McHale	Torricelli
Durbin	McKinney	Towns
Engel	McNulty	Tucker
Eshoo	Meehan	Velazquez
Evans	Meek	Vento
Farr	Menendez	Visclosky
Fattah	Mfume	Volkmer
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Ward
Fields (LA)	Mineta	Waters
Filner	Minge	Watt (NC)
Foglietta	Mink	Waxman
Ford	Mollohan	Williams
Frank (MA)	Montgomery	Wilson
Frost	Moran	Wise
Furse	Murtha	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Nadler	Wyden
Gephardt	Neal	Wynn
Gibbons	Oberstar	Yates
Gonzalez	Obey	

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra	Edwards
Bliley	Flake
Brown (CA)	Jefferson
Deal	

McCollum
McDade

Moakley
Peterson (FL)

Schumer
Stark

□ 1254

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Bliley for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Mr. MINGE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. STENHOLM changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were ayes 271, noes 146, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

AYES—271

Allard	Cunningham	Hayworth
Archer	Danner	Hefley
Armey	Davis	Heineman
Bachus	de la Garza	Hergert
Baesler	Deal	Hilleary
Baker (CA)	DeLay	Hobson
Baker (LA)	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Ballenger	Dickey	Hoke
Barr	Doolittle	Holden
Barrett (NE)	Dornan	Horn
Bartlett	Doyle	Hostettler
Barton	Dreier	Houghton
Bass	Duncan	Hunter
Bateman	Dunn	Hutchinson
Bereuter	Ehlers	Hyde
Bevill	Ehrlich	Inglis
Bilbray	Emerson	Istook
Bilirakis	English	Jacobs
Blute	Ensign	Johnson (CT)
Boehlert	Everett	Johnson (SD)
Boehner	Ewing	Johnson, Sam
Bonilla	Fawell	Kasich
Bono	Fields (TX)	Kelly
Brewster	Flanagan	Kim
Browder	Foley	King
Brownback	Forbes	Kingston
Bryant (TN)	Ford	Klug
Bunn	Fowler	Knollenberg
Bunning	Fox	Kolbe
Burr	Franks (CT)	LaHood
Burton	Franks (NJ)	Largent
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Calvert	Frisa	LaTourette
Camp	Funderburk	Laughlin
Canady	Gallely	Lazio
Castle	Ganske	Leach
Chabot	Gekas	Lewis (CA)
Chambliss	Geren	Lewis (KY)
Chenoweth	Gilchrest	Lightfoot
Christensen	Gillmor	Lincoln
Chrysler	Gilman	Linder
Clement	Goodlatte	Livingston
Clinger	Goodling	LoBiondo
Coble	Gordon	Longley
Coburn	Goss	Lucas
Coleman	Graham	Luther
Collins (GA)	Greenwood	Manzullo
Combest	Gunderson	Martini
Condit	Gutknecht	McCrery
Cooley	Hall (TX)	McHale
Cox	Hamilton	McHugh
Cramer	Hancock	McInnis
Crane	Hansen	McIntosh
Crapo	Hastert	McKeon
Cremeans	Hastings (WA)	McNulty
Cubin	Hayes	Metcalf

Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bishop
Bionir
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clayburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse

Bliley
Buyer
Edwards
Farr
Flake
Jefferson

Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm

NOES—146

Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecza
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Manton
Markley
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler

NOT VOTING—17

Jones
Maloney
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
Moakley

Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Neal
Oberstar
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pickett
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wilson
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

On this vote:

Mr. Bliley for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Ms. LOFGREN changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 390, I inadvertently missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BEILENSEN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman is recognized for his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, am I correct in saying that the next vote will be on the previous question on the rule on legislative branch appropriations?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Continuing my inquiry, if I may, Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, will I be recognized to control the hour of additional debate time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member had led the fight against the previous question. The answer would be yes.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Continuing my inquiry, if I may, Mr. Speaker, if I control the time, would I be in a position to offer an amendment to the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A proper amendment would be in order.

PRINTING OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 169

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment that I would offer to House Resolution 169 be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the proposed amendment is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. . . Before consideration of any other amendment, it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider the following two amendments in the order specified:

1. An amendment to be offered by Representative BREWSTER of Oklahoma and Representative HARMAN of California:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE IV—DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCKBOX

DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND; DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENTS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS

SEC. 401. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United

□ 1303

The Clerk announced the following pair: